UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,639	05/16/2006	Peter Tunguy-Desmarais	5288-0102PUS1	8755
	7590 08/10/200 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747	CH 3/A 22040 0747	KARPINSKI, LUKE E		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/10/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/562,639	TUNGUY-DESMARAIS, PETER		
Examiner	Art Unit		

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence add	dress
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 July 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid aba application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, vapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the followance.	which places the or (3) a Request
periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, wh	
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejective Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FIMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropria have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropria under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, and reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>24 July 2009</u> . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismiss Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a AMENDMENTS	sal of the appeal.
3. 🔯 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered be	ecause
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	304430
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying tappeal; and/or	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment ((PTOL-324).
5. 🔲 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendme non-allowable claim(s). 	nt canceling the
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an entered how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5 and 7</u> .	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will no because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, we entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fair showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	ls to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attach REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	ned.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowar See Continuation Sheet.	nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other:	
/Mina Haghighatian/	
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1616	
ary Examinor, 7 at orac 1010	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The newly proposed claimes add perecntage limitations that would need further consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive. Applicant argues that '236 teaches a major portion of a vaporizable ingredient and therefore teaches away from the film forming liquid of claim 1. This argument is not found persuasive because the '236 patent clearly states that the polysiloxanes and the anti-bacterial agent are required and that all other components are optional (page 2, lines 33-36).

Applicant also argues that Van Cleave teaches a different treatment. This argument is not found persuasive because Van Cleave teaches treating disorders of the ear canal by application of similar formulations.

Applicant also argues that the citations of Van Cleave are taken from several different portions of the document. This argument is not found persuasive because the references are used as a whole; several different portions are cited in order to point specifically where the claimed limitations are located in the document rather than citing the document as a whole.

Applicant also argues that Saleh does not cure the deficiencies of the other references. Saleh is utilized to teach that tea tree oil is an antimicrobial and known to be utilized in skin care formulations.